

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-33 and 46-51 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 26, and 51 have been modified. No claims have been added, or canceled. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 1-33 and 46-51 are presented for examination.

Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 46-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al) and U.S. Patent No. 6,742,043 (Moussa et al).

As correctly stated in the Office action, Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest “detecting an intended recipient’s receiving device during a request from the recipient to retrieve the particular message.” The Office action combined Rabe-Hesketh with Moussa to show this feature.

Moussa is directed at reformatting and delivering requested web content based on information indicative of a web client’s capability (Moussa, Abstract). The web client makes a request for web content along with information indicative of the web client’s capability (Moussa, col. 6, lines 47-50). The information indicative of the client’s capability is in the header or form data of the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request (Moussa, col. 6, line 50-52). A proxy of the web server reformats the requested web content and sends the reformatted web content to the web client (Moussa, col. 7, lines 8-14).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:

specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;

receiving a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;

detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message;

responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular message and inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, said link capable of referencing the particular attachment that has been removed;

delivering the particular e-mail message to the intended recipient;

and

in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, retrieving a copy of the particular attachment that is automatically formatted based on the specified preference.

(Claim 1, as amended) Claim 1, as amended, recites "detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message."

In other words, claim 1 recites "detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device" as part of request to retrieve an e-mail message. Applicants' dynamic capability detection is supported at Page 8, Line 25 – Page 9, Line 9. Thus, claim 1 recites dynamically detecting capabilities of a receiving device during a request to retrieve an e-mail message and not as part of a request to retrieve a web page, as is disclosed by Moussa. In addition, because the Examiner admits that Rabe-Hesketh does not disclose "detecting an intended recipient's receiving device during a request from the recipient to retrieve the particular message", Rabe-Hesketh cannot disclose "detecting

an intended recipient's receiving device during a request from the recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message."

Thus, Moussa, whether considered separately or in combination with Rabe-Hesketh, fails to disclose or suggest "detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message" as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-25 that depend on claim 1 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Claim 26, as amended, recites:

In an online system, a method for providing digital images to target devices, the method comprising:
receiving an e-mail message having one or more attached objects;
detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device,
wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the
intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;
responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device
and responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of the
intended recipient's receiving device, detaching said objects from said
message and automatically transforming copies of said objects to a
resolution fidelity that is more useful to said target devices;
for each detached object, generating a reference allowing retrieval
of a transformed copy of the detached object; and
delivering the e-mail message to the target devices, the e-mail
message including said generated reference for each detached object.

(Claim 26, as amended). Neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa teach or suggest "detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message," as discussed above. Therefore, claim 26 and claims 27-33 that depend on claim 26 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Claim 46 recites:

An e-mail system for providing e-mail having attachments, the system comprising:

an e-mail server for:

receiving a particular e-mail message having an attachment, the particular e-mail message being addressed to a recipient having a target device capable of receiving e-mail, the attachment including one or more objects, and

detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;

an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one reference responsive to detecting the target device and responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device;

a transformation module for transforming the objects of the attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device; and

a retrieval module allowing retrieval of the transformed objects, in response to invocation of at least one reference.

(Claim 46). As discussed above, neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa alone or in combination teach or suggest “detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail message”. Therefore, claim 46 and claims 47-50 that depend on claim 46 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.

Claim 51, as amended, recites:

In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:

specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;

receiving a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;

detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message;

responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding

capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular e-mail message and inserting a copy of the particular attachment that is automatically formatted based on the specified preference; and
delivering the particular e-mail message to an intended recipient.

(Claim 51, as amended). As discussed above, neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa teach or suggest "detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message". Therefore, claim 51 is not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh and Moussa.


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/17/06


Judith Szepesi
Reg. No. 39,393

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300